

Identity and the Language of the Classroom: Investigating the Impact of Heritage Versus Second Language Instruction on Personal and Collective Self-Esteem

Stephen C. Wright
University of California, Santa Cruz

Donald M. Taylor
McGill University

The connection between heritage language instruction and self-esteem was investigated. Participants were Inuit, White, and mixed-heritage (Inuit-White) children living in a subarctic community. Testing occurred before and after their 1st year in a heritage language or a 2nd language program. Children from all 3 groups who were educated in their heritage language showed a substantial increase in their personal self-esteem, whereas Inuit and mixed-heritage children educated in a 2nd language did not. Among the Inuit, Inuit instruction was associated with positive regard for the ingroup, whereas English or French instruction was associated with preference for the White outgroup. The present findings support claims that early heritage language education can have a positive effect on the personal and collective self-esteem of minority language students—a benefit not provided by 2nd language instruction.

In the present study, we investigated the differential effects of early education in the heritage language versus early immersion in a second language on the child's personal and collective self-esteem. The question of language of instruction has been the center of considerable public and academic debate. Traditional thinking held that early entry into English language education would speed the minority language student's transition into the majority culture and improve his or her chances of competing in the mainstream society. In many cases, zealous supporters of this assimilationist perspective set out to replace the student's heritage languages with the dominant language. Some of the clearest and most dramatic examples of this can be found in North America's history of educating Native American and Cana-

dian Native children. In residential schools in both Canada and the United States, children were verbally berated, publicly humiliated, and even physically punished for using their heritage language (Freeman, 1978; Jordon, 1988; Pelletier, 1970; Platero, 1975). In fact, eradication of the child's heritage language and identity was an explicit goal of many residential and missionary schools (Cummins, 1990; Tschantz, 1980). Although the tactics may have mellowed, we continue to find considerable support for the assimilationist—"English only" position.

In contrast to this view is the movement toward early heritage language education. Many of these programs involve the use of a bilingual classroom, in which the child's heritage language and the dominant second language are both used. Less frequently, early instruction is offered exclusively in the child's heritage language.

The controversy over heritage language education has involved political and practical as well as pedagogical issues. Among the pedagogical issues are the child's general academic achievement, the pace of second language acquisition, maintenance of heritage language fluency, development of heritage language literacy, and the ease of transition into the school environment (see August & Garcia, 1988; Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1989; Cummins & Swain, 1986; Genesee, 1987; Taylor, Meynard, & Rheault, 1977). The enormous variability in the types of programs and in the groups of students involved in heritage language education has posed difficulties for researchers in this area. Despite these challenges and the opposition of English-only advocates, evidence indicates that minority language speakers benefit from early instruction in their heritage language. At present, three conclusions appear warranted. First, using children's heritage language in the school has a positive impact on their subsequent abilities in the heritage lan-

Stephen C. Wright, Psychology Department, University of California, Santa Cruz; Donald M. Taylor, Psychology Department, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

This research was supported by a grant from the Kativik School Board and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

We thank the following people for their contributions to this research project: the community, all the children who took part in our study, and the Education Committee and staff at Jaanimmarik School. We especially acknowledge the effort and time given by Principal Marguerite Kopiec. We also thank the testers: Michelle Auroy, Claudette Baron, Gaston Coté, Mary Elijassiapik, Annie Kudluk, Judy McArthur, and Sue McNicol. Their many hours of hard work are greatly appreciated. Finally, we offer special thanks to Doris Winkler and Mary Aitchison who provide continuous, invaluable assistance with our work in Arctic Quebec and to Karen Ruggiero who has made important contributions to this research.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Stephen C. Wright, Psychology Department, Clark Kerr Hall, University of California, Santa Cruz, California 95064. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to swright@cats.ucsc.edu.

guage. It appears that the school can play a role in the maintenance and enhancement of first-language skills (see Crawford, 1989). Second, heritage language instruction need not result in academic impairment. Minority students in programs that use their heritage language have, in some cases, shown faster academic progress (for reviews, see Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1989). Third, the common assumption that the use of the heritage language will negatively affect the acquisition of English skills is clearly false. In fact, there is evidence that heritage language instruction may result in better performance in English in the long run (see Willig, 1985).

As the support for heritage language education grows, some authors have claimed in the strongest terms that greater use of heritage languages in school is a necessary remedy for present patterns of school failure among minority students (Cummins, 1989, 1990; McLaughlin, 1989). In addition, these authors have looked beyond the linguistic advantages of heritage language education and are pointing to potential social benefits. Very often one of the stated or implicit mechanisms by which heritage language education is to improve academic success is through enhancement of the child's self-esteem (see Appel, 1988; Cummins, 1989, 1990; Hernández-Chavez, 1984). This view has gained considerable acceptance among heritage language advocates.

It is widely accepted that children who think highly of themselves stand a much better chance of being successful in school. Strong correlations between self-esteem and academic success provide support for this belief (Covington, 1989; Harter, 1986). The causal direction of this relationship is controversial. It has been proposed that rather than higher self-esteem leading to increased achievement, it is the success associated with high achievement that leads to a more positive evaluation of the self (Rosenberg, Schooler, & Schoenbach, 1989). Although further investigation of the question of causal direction is needed, most educators believe that self-esteem is an important determinant of academic success. Evidence of the breadth of this acceptance is found in the numerous programs that have been implemented in an attempt to increase self-esteem with the expectation that this will translate into enhanced academic performance.

Personal and Collective Self-Esteem

At present, considerable disagreement exists in the literature on self-esteem and minority children (see Porter & Washington, 1979). Much of this controversy can be traced to a failure to recognize the distinction between two different dimensions or levels of self-esteem. Until recently, the psychological literature has shared with mainstream North American culture a conception of the self as an independent, self-contained, autonomous entity (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Moghaddam, Taylor, & Wright, 1993; Sampson, 1988). For the most part, self-esteem has been represented as the evaluation of one's personal characteristic, of one's *independent self*. Contrary to this view is the growing recognition that a child's (and an adult's, for that matter)

sense of who she or he is includes at least two components or levels: the personal identity and the social or collective identity.

Personal identity involves those aspects of the self that make the individual unique—personal attributes, skills, and experiences. It is an evaluation of this level of identity that is tapped by most of the traditional work on self-esteem. For this reason, we might appropriately think of most of the standard measures of self-esteem as measuring personal self-esteem. The other level of identity, the collective self, involves those aspects of the individual that connect her or him with others—group memberships. Just as there are dimensions of personal self-esteem (see Marsh, Craven, & Debus, 1991; Marsh & Shavelson, 1985), there are likely to be numerous group memberships that contribute to one's collective self-esteem. Examples of these could be one's ethnic heritage, family, peer group, or, for a child, the classroom or school. This view of the self suggests that the individual's feelings of self-worth involve an analysis not only of the personal or unique aspect of the self (i.e., personal self-esteem), but also of the social or collective aspects (i.e., collective self-esteem; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Cross, 1987).

Recognition of this distinction goes a long way in explaining the contradictory findings concerning self-esteem and children from traditionally disadvantaged minority groups. At a personal level, there are a number of effective mechanisms by which disadvantaged group members can maintain high personal self-esteem (see Crocker & Major, 1989). However, faced with societal and educational structures that contain both subtle and overt reminders of the low status held by their group, minority children can suffer from reduced collective self-esteem. A tradition of research that dates to the seminal doll studies of Clark and Clark (1939) demonstrates a lower evaluation of the ethnic ingroup by young Black children. Others have replicated these results with Canadian Native (Corenblum & Annis, 1987; George & Hoppe, 1979), Mexican American (Weiland & Coughlin, 1979), and Chinese American children (Aboud & Skerry, 1984). This lower evaluation of the ingroup is indicative of a negative collective self-esteem.

Heritage Language Education and Self-Esteem

Heritage language education may have a positive effect on both personal and collective self-esteem. At the personal level, minority language children will be spared the frustration of not understanding much of what goes on in the (majority language) classroom (which can lead to poorer performance and an associated lower self-evaluation). In addition, heritage language education spares children from the negative self-evaluation that is likely to result from social comparison with majority language speakers, who are likely to be more successful than themselves in majority language classrooms. Finally, when language is associated with cultural differences, the minority student may be distanced from the activities and interpersonal interactions in the majority language classroom, and psychological isola-

tion could contribute to a negative self-image. These children are less likely to face these problems in a heritage language classroom.

In North America, considerable importance is placed on skills and knowledge acquired in school. If English is the sole language of instruction, children may be led to believe that the important knowledge and skills imparted at school must be learned in English. Thus, the English language is directly paired with the knowledge and skills necessary for achievement and status. In contrast, if children who speak the minority language are characterized as "deficient" or "in need of remediation," the child's heritage language is paired with lower status. The status of those who speak English is further enhanced in that most, if not all, of the high-status people at school (teachers, principals, etc.) speak English. As the minority language child becomes aware that membership in the majority language group is an important determinant of success, the relative value of his or her ingroup is reduced. In all these cases, group level social comparisons made in an English-only context can suggest to the minority child, either directly or subtly, that the majority group is inherently superior to his or her ingroup. When these messages are combined with a general societal devaluation of the heritage language, the result may well be lowered collective self-esteem.

The use of the heritage language as the medium of instruction, on the other hand, is a clear affirmation of the value and status of the heritage language and of those who speak it. When heritage language education involves coethnic educators, these models will affirm that ingroup members can hold high-status positions. The important skills learned at school are not distinguished by language, and the children are not presented with a direct connection between their language group and poorer performance.

Despite the wide acceptance of the potential for heritage language education to have a positive impact on self-esteem, very little research has tested this belief. Alexander and Baker (1992) argue that without such evidence it is irresponsible and even unethical to continue to promote heritage language education as a mechanism for increasing self-esteem. The present research provides a direct test of the proposed relationship between language programs (majority language vs. heritage language) and self-esteem. This analysis is also extended by including measures of both personal and collective self-esteem.

Present Research Paradigm

The present procedures arise out of a history of research dating back to the early Black and White doll studies of Clark and Clark (1939; for reviews, see Aboud, 1988; Brand, Ruiz, & Padilla, 1974; Williams & Morland, 1976). To avoid problems found with previous studies of this type (Aboud, 1988; Corenblum & Wilson, 1982; Newman, Liss, & Sherman, 1983; Trent, 1964), the present research used coethnic testers; photographs rather than drawings or dolls as stimulus materials; and a multiple-alternative method rather than a forced choice between only a pair of stimulus

alternatives. Inuit, White, and mixed-heritage children living in an isolated subarctic community and attending school in Inuttit, English, or French were tested at the beginning and the end of their kindergarten year.

The present study expanded on previous strategies by including measures of both personal and collective self-esteem. Each child was shown a set of nine photographs, including four ingroup and four outgroup members as well as a photo of himself or herself. Personal self-esteem was measured by the frequency with which the child selected his or her own photograph in response to positive attributes and excluded it in response to negative attributes. Due to the lack of previous research with Inuit children, no a priori predictions were made about ethnic differences in personal self-esteem. However, it was hypothesized that when compared to second-language instruction, heritage language education would have a positive impact on the children's personal self-esteem.

Two measures of collective self-esteem were used. The first involved comparing the children's evaluation of the ethnic ingroup with their evaluation of the ethnic outgroup. The frequency with which the children selected members of their ethnic ingroup in response to positive attributes and excluded them in response to negative attributes was used as a measure of their general evaluation of their ethnic ingroup. Similarly, the children's pattern of selecting and excluding members of the ethnic outgroup provided a measure of their general evaluation of the ethnic outgroup. A comparison of these two measures provided an indication of the children's collective self-esteem. The second measure of collective self-esteem was the strength of the children's preference for ingroup versus outgroup members as potential friends.

Several authors have claimed that a healthy collective self-esteem should result in a mild preferential evaluation of the ingroup. This should be accompanied by a mild preference for ingroup members as friends or friendship selection without consideration of ethnicity (see Aboud, 1988). However, a large differential evaluation in favor of the ingroup or a near exclusive preference for ingroup members as friends may reflect ethnocentric attitudes. A bias either in evaluation or friendship selection toward the outgroup, on the other hand, would be indicative of a devaluation of one's ethnic group and less than ideal collective self-esteem.

Again, the lack of previous research with Inuit children lead to no a priori predictions concerning ethnic differences on the general level of collective self-esteem. However, it was hypothesized that, when compared to second language instruction, heritage language instruction would result in higher collective self-esteem as measured by both the relative evaluations of the ethnic groups and friendship preferences.

Method

This study was part of a longitudinal research project designed to investigate the impact of heritage language education versus second language education across a number of domains.

Community

The community that served as the focus for this study is located in the region of Northern Quebec, Canada, known to its inhabitants as Nunavik. This vast subarctic region contains 14 isolated communities. The present study was conducted in the largest of these communities, whose population of 1,400 is made up of approximately 80% Inuit, 12% Francophones, and 8% Anglophones (Taylor & Wright, 1989).

The Inuit of Nunavik remained extremely isolated from the mainstream Canadian-American society until as late as the mid-1950s, and the communities of Nunavik remain relatively isolated even today. They are accessible only by air, and many Inuit residents have never seen an urban center. Despite a growing trend toward intermarriage, contact between the Inuit and White groups of residents (particularly the Francophone and Inuit populations) remains minimal. Most Inuit children will have had very little contact with Whites prior to entering school.

More than 90% of the Inuit from this region claim Inuttit (the heritage language of the Inuit) as their first language. Compared to virtually all other Native languages in North America, in Nunavik Inuttit remains a highly functional and vibrant language. In fact, it has been described by several researchers as one of the few Native languages in North America that has a good chance of long-term survival (Foster, 1982; Priest, 1985). Despite these optimistic claims, many have become concerned about the erosion of the language. Similarly, concerns have been raised about the extent to which the growing White population exerts economic and political control over the people and lands of Nunavik.

Participants and Programs

The participants included every child who entered kindergarten over the 3-year period between 1989 and 1991 and approximately half the children entering in 1992. Thus, data were collected from four cohorts. School board policy allows parents to register their children in one of three language programs in kindergarten: Inuttit, English, or French. All instruction and most classroom materials are in the language of that program. The school board has made a considerable effort to provide books and other materials in Inuttit for the Inuttit program and to provide materials that reflect Northern-Inuit culture in all three languages (Taylor, 1990). However, White teachers in the English and French programs do make use of mainstream Canadian-American materials, most of which reflect mainstream White culture. Also, some Inuit teachers occasionally use English materials (i.e., films, posters) in the Inuttit program. In Grade 3 the Inuttit program is terminated, and children enroll in either English or French.

Turnover rates among White teachers are high in these isolated northern schools, and many White teachers who do stay choose to move into higher grade levels. In addition, Inuit teachers sometimes choose to stay with their specific group of children for kindergarten through Grade 2. Thus, over the 4-year period during which testing took place, there were three different English teachers and a different Inuttit and French teacher each year. The exact ethnic composition of each of the three language programs was different in each of the 4 years. However, in every case, French classes contained a mixture of Inuit, White, and mixed-heritage children, whereas the Inuttit and English classes contained a mixture of Inuit and mixed-heritage children.

The final sample contained 64 Inuit, 13 White, and 36 mixed-heritage (Inuit-White) children. Inuttit was the first language of 62 of the Inuit participants. The other 2 were native speakers of English. Eleven of the White children were native speakers of

French (Francophones), with the remaining 2 being English speakers (Anglophones). English was the first language for 30 of the mixed-heritage children, with 3 speaking French and 2 speaking Inuttit.

Over the 4-year period, 36 Inuit children were enrolled in the Inuttit language program, 15 were enrolled in the French program, and 13 were enrolled in the English program. Among the White children, all of the Francophones ($n = 11$) were enrolled in the French program, one of the Anglophones enrolled in the English program, and the other enrolled in the Inuttit program. Mixed-heritage children were almost equally divided between the Inuttit ($n = 14$), English ($n = 11$), and French ($n = 11$) programs.

Procedures and Materials

The self-esteem task was completed as part of a battery of tests that included measures of language, arithmetic, and spatial ability. The self-esteem task was always administered in the child's heritage language by a native speaker of that language. Children were taken from their school classes during regular instruction and tested individually. Each child was tested twice, once during the first week of the school year (fall) and again at the end of the school year (spring).

The tester first took a photograph of the child. This photo was added to a set of eight "head-and-shoulder" photos of children who were approximately the same age as the participant. Each set of photos contained 4 Inuit children (2 boys and 2 girls) and 4 White children (2 boys and 2 girls) who were not known to the participants. The eight target photos were drawn from a larger set of photos that were pretested using four Inuit and four White adult raters. Photographs of Inuit and White children were matched for physical attractiveness, facial expression, and photograph quality.

The child was asked to sort the photos 11 times on the basis of different characteristics. Testers used a standard request on each of these sorting trials: "Pick all the children who _____ [are smart, nice, etc.] and put them here, and leave all the children who are not _____ here" (pointing to the surface in front of the child). Before each request the tester shuffled the photos and placed them randomly on the surface in front of the child.

In the first three requests the tester asked the child to pick out the girls, the boys, and the Inuit. These requests served three functions. First, they ensured that the child understood the task. Second, they were used to determine whether the children could appropriately identify the children in the photos and whether they were able to use gender and ethnicity categories. Finally, the third question served as an initial measure of the child's ethnic self-categorization.

In the next seven trials the child was asked to pick all the children who are smart, nice, happy, and good at many things; those who have lots of friends; those who like to go to school; and those who the other children don't like. A score of 1 was given each time the child included a photo in response to a positive attribute and a score of -1 was given if he or she included the photo in response to the one negative attribute.

The frequency with which the children selected themselves in response to six positive attributes and failed to pick themselves in response to the single negative attribute provided a measure of their personal self-esteem. Thus, total scores could range from -1 to 6.

Separate scores were computed for the child's evaluation of Inuit and White targets. These scores consisted of the frequency with which the child selected the four Inuit targets (or the four

White targets) in response to six positive attributes and ignored them in response to the negative attribute. Thus, each of these two scores could range from -4 (selecting all four Inuit targets only in response to the negative attribute) to 24 (selecting all four Inuit targets only in response to the six positive attributes). The child's collective self-esteem along the dimension of ethnicity was assessed by comparing his or her evaluation of ethnic ingroup and outgroup targets. A healthy or strong collective self-esteem was demonstrated by a slightly higher score for the ingroup compared to the outgroup. A preferential evaluation of the outgroup would be indicative of a negative or low collective self-esteem. Finally, a very high rating of the ingroup combined with a low evaluation of the outgroup can be interpreted as demonstrating ethnocentric attitudes.

In the final sorting trial the tester asked the child to pick the children that he or she would like to have as best friends. Separate scores were computed for the child's interest in White and Inuit targets as potential friends. These two scores were the total number of Inuit and White targets selected. Thus, these two scores could range from 0 (no Inuit children selected) to 4 (all Inuit children selected). The child's relative preference for ingroup or outgroup members as friends provided a second indication of collective self-esteem.

Data Analysis

Separate analyses were performed on these three dependent measures—personal self-esteem, ingroup versus outgroup evaluation, and friendship preference. Unfortunately, only one White child was enrolled in a second language program. The absence of this cell precluded the performance of the complete factorial design. Therefore, for each dependent measure a general analysis comparing the three ethnic groups was followed by separate analyses for each ethnic group. These separate analyses assessed the generality of any overall findings and tested the impact of language of instruction on Inuit and mixed-heritage children.

In all cases, simple main effects tests were used to investigate interaction effects that result in the omnibus analysis. Where post hoc pairwise comparisons of means were called for, Tukey honestly significant difference (HSD) procedure was used (Winer, Brown, & Michels, 1991).

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Gender

A ($3 \times 2 \times 2$) Ethnicity of Participant (Inuit, White, mixed-heritage) \times Time of Testing (fall, spring) \times Ethnicity of Target (Inuit, White) mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to investigate the accuracy of the children's responses to the questions concerning the gender of the children in the photos. This analysis yielded no significant effects. Most of the children accurately categorized the photos by gender at both testing occasions (86% accuracy in the fall and 89% accuracy in the spring). This accuracy rate is consistent with previous research. In addition, the vast majority of children appeared to understand the instructions and the nature of the task.

Additionally, an analysis of each of the target photos demonstrated that one particular photograph—one Inuit

girl—accounted for 83% of the errors. The possibility that there was some ambiguity about the gender of this particular child further supports the conclusions that the participants were able to comprehend the task and were aware of the gender distinction.

Finally, two Inuit children were dropped from further analyses because the accuracy of their answers on the questions concerning gender (as well as the question on ethnicity) were less than chance. We interpreted this to mean that they were unable to understand the nature of the task.

Ethnicity

Self-Categorization. In the fall, 92% of the Inuit children identified their own photo as Inuit. This number increased to 97% in the spring. In the fall, 93% of the White children identified their own photo as White, increasing to 100% in the spring. These data indicate considerable accuracy in the self-categorization of both Inuit and White children, with the expected increase in accuracy over the school year.

For mixed-heritage children the question of accuracy becomes somewhat unclear. In a very real sense, these children are "accurate" if they place themselves in either of these two ethnic categories, and the forced-choice format used in this question did not allow children to select both. However, most mixed-heritage children willingly selected an ethnic category for themselves, and the forced-choice procedure provided interesting information about the child's strongest identification.

At the beginning of their kindergarten year (fall), 52% of the mixed-heritage children identified themselves as Inuit. At the end of the year (spring) the number had dropped to 39%. This difference failed to reach traditional levels of statistical significance.

Categorization of others. A ($3 \times 2 \times 2$) Ethnicity of Participant (Inuit, White, Mixed Heritage) \times Time of Testing (fall, spring) \times Ethnicity of Target (Inuit, White) mixed ANOVA was performed on the accuracy of the participants' responses to the question concerning ethnicity of the target children in the photos. This analysis yielded a significant main effect of time of test, $F(1, 100) = 14.14, p < .001, MSE = 7.0$, indicating that the children were significantly more accurate about the ethnicity of targets at the end of their kindergarten year (spring, 88%) than at the beginning (fall, 77%).

The main effect of ethnicity of target was also significant, $F(1, 100) = 6.68, p < .05, MSE = 5.1$, but was subsumed under a significant Ethnicity of Participant \times Ethnicity of Target interaction, $F(2, 100) = 3.79, p < .05, MSE = 5.11$. Tests of simple main effect confirmed that White children were significantly more accurate in their categorization of members of the outgroup (89%) than they were at categorizing members of their ingroup (68%), $F(1, 12) = 4.62, p < .05$. Inuit children also showed a similar, although not statistically significant, tendency (outgroup, 88% and ingroup, 83%). Mixed-heritage children showed little difference in the accuracy with which they identified the ethnicity of the targets (Inuit, 81%; White, 80%).

Personal Self-Esteem

A personal self-esteem score was determined by the frequency with which the child included himself or herself in response to positive attributes and excluded himself or herself in response to the negative attribute.

Comparison of Three Ethnic Groups

A (3 × 2) Ethnicity of Participant × Time of Test mixed ANOVA was performed. Both the main effect of ethnicity of participant, $F(2, 101) = 11.45, p < .001, MSE = 1.95$, and the main effect of time of test, $F(1, 101) = 3.94, p < .05, MSE = 1.75$, were significant.

This analysis indicated no interaction effect between these two variables ($F < 1.0$). Therefore, to investigate the main effects of ethnic group, personal self-esteem scores were collapsed across the two testing times. Post hoc Tukey hsd tests indicated that this effect resulted from both White ($M = 5.46, SD = 0.87$) and mixed-heritage ($M = 5.34, SD = 0.81$) children having significantly higher ($p < .05$) personal self-esteem scores than Inuit children ($M = 4.38, SD = 1.09$).

The main effect of time of test indicated that, on average, the children showed an increase in self-evaluation over their first year in school (fall, $M = 4.56, SD = 1.55$; spring, $M = 5.04, SD = 1.30$).

Separate analyses were performed for each of the three ethnic groups. These analyses investigated the robustness of this increase in personal self-esteem across the three groups and also allowed for the inclusion of the third variable of language of instruction for the Inuit and Mixed-Heritage groups.

White Children

As shown in the first row of Table 1, White children showed a considerable increase in personal self-esteem from the fall to the spring. However, due to the very small sample size for this group and a possible ceiling effect in the spring ($M = 5.82$ on a scale bound by 6.00), the statistical

test failed to reach traditional levels of significance. However, a strong effect size ($\eta^2 = .15$)¹ for this comparison appears to indicate a real increase in personal self-esteem for our sample of White children.

Inuit Children

Inuit children enrolled in the French and English programs were combined into a single "second language programs" group and were compared with those enrolled in the heritage language program (Inuttitut). A (2 × 2) Language of Instruction × Time of Test mixed ANOVA yielded a significant interaction, $F(1, 57) = 3.89, p < .05, MSE = 2.28$, which is illustrated in the middle section of Table 1. Although children in both language programs began the year with almost identical scores, subsequent simple main effects tests confirmed that only the children in the heritage language program (Inuttitut) showed a significant increase in personal self-esteem $F(1, 31) = 6.85, p < .05, MSE = 2.43$.

Mixed-Heritage Children

Mixed-heritage children were also divided into two groups: those receiving instruction in their heritage language and those receiving instruction in a second language. A (2 × 2) Language of Instruction × Time of Test mixed ANOVA was performed on the personal self-esteem scores. The Language of Instruction × Time of Testing interaction approached traditional levels of significance, $F(1, 34) = 2.64, p = .11, MSE = 0.82$ (see the third section of Table 1). The similarity of this pattern to that of the Inuit children, combined with the relatively small sample size and a moderate effect size ($\eta^2 = .07$), points to the potential importance of this interaction. Mixed-heritage children in heritage language instruction showed an increase in personal self-esteem from the fall to the spring. Conversely, those in second language evidenced a small reduction in personal self-esteem over this period.

Collective Self-Esteem: Ingroup vs. Outgroup Evaluations

The frequency with which ethnic ingroup targets were selected in response to positive attributes (and were ignored in response to the negative attribute) was compared to the frequency with which outgroup targets were selected in response to positive attributes (and were ignored in response to the negative attribute). This comparison provided the first measure of the child's collective self-esteem along the dimension of ethnicity.

¹ Cohen (1988) has established a widely accepted set of conventions for interpreting effect size (see also Cohen, 1992). The η^2 statistic represents the amount of variance accounted for in the dependent variable by the effect. Cohen proposes the following conventions for interpreting this statistic: small $\eta^2 = .01$; medium $\eta^2 = .06$; and large $\eta^2 = .14$.

Table 1
Personal Self-Esteem Scores for White, Inuit, and Mixed-Heritage Children by Language Program at the Beginning and the End of Their Kindergarten Year

Child's ethnicity and language program	Time of testing			
	Fall		Spring	
	M	SD	M	SD
White				
Heritage language ($n = 12$)	5.10	1.55	5.82	1.29
Inuit				
Heritage language ($n = 32$)	4.10	1.69	5.10	1.22
Second language ($n = 27$)	4.16	1.63	4.10	1.49
Mixed-Heritage				
Heritage language ($n = 14$)	4.91	1.11	5.37	1.05
Second language ($n = 22$)	5.31	0.87	5.05	0.75

Comparison of Three Ethnic Groups

A (3 × 2 × 2) Ethnicity of Participant × Time of Test × Ethnicity of Target ANOVA was performed on the ingroup and outgroup evaluation scores. A significant main effect of ethnicity of target, $F(1, 101) = 18.76, p < .001, MSE = 22.46$, was qualified by a significant Ethnicity of Participant × Ethnicity of Target interaction, $F(2, 101) = 7.23, p < .01, MSE = 22.46$. Table 2 shows that White and mixed-heritage children evaluated White targets more positively than Inuit targets. Inuit children, on the other hand, showed no difference in their evaluation of the two target groups. To further explore these findings and to investigate the potential effects of language of instruction on collective self-esteem, separate analyses were performed for each of the three ethnic groups.

White children. Because all but one of the White children received instruction in their heritage language, only the (2 × 2) Time of Testing × Ethnicity of Target repeated measures ANOVA was possible. A significant main effect of ethnicity of target, $F(1, 11) = 6.75, p < .05, MSE = 49.38$, indicated that White children evaluated White targets more positively than Inuit targets (see the first line of Table 2). Although the two-way interaction only approached traditional levels of significance, $F(1, 11) = 2.87, p = .11, MSE = 10.91$, it was associated with a strong effect size ($\eta^2 = .21$). Although White children evaluated White targets more positively than Inuit targets at both testings, this White bias was greater in the spring (for White targets, $M = 15.25, SD = 5.15$; for Inuit targets, $M = 8.37, SD = 5.53$) than in the fall (for White targets, $M = 18.33, SD = 5.87$; for Inuit targets, $M = 14.68, SD = 6.48$).

Inuit children. Inuit children were divided into two groups, those enrolled in second language programs (French or English) and those enrolled in the heritage language program (Inuttitut). A (2 × 2 × 2) Time of Test × Ethnicity of Target × Language Program mixed ANOVA yielded a significant Language Program × Ethnicity of Target interaction, $F(1, 57) = 7.00, p < .05, MSE = 15.41$. Subsequent tests of simple main effects confirmed that this interaction (see Table 3) results because Inuit children in the heritage language program showed a bias toward ingroup members, whereas Inuit children in second language programs exhibited a significant bias toward the outgroup $F(1, 26) = 4.48, p < .05, MSE = 6.04$. It should also be noted that there was

Table 2
Evaluation of Inuit and White Targets by Children From Each of the Three Ethnic Groups

Child's ethnicity	Ethnicity of target photo			
	Inuit		White	
	M	SD	M	SD
White (n = 13)	11.53 _a	5.14	16.79 _b	4.73
Inuit (n = 59)	13.49	3.50	13.42	3.75
Mixed-Heritage (n = 33)	13.92 _a	3.65	16.12 _b	3.85

Note. Analyses of simple main effects indicate that scores in the same rows with different subscripts differ significantly ($p < .05$).

Table 3
Evaluation of Inuit and White Targets by Inuit Children in Heritage Language and Second Language Programs

Language program	Ethnicity of target photo			
	Inuit		White	
	M	SD	M	SD
Heritage language (n = 32)	13.92	3.05	12.62	3.97
Second language (n = 27)	12.96 _a	3.96	14.40 _b	3.30

Note. Analyses of simple main effects indicate that scores in the same rows with different subscripts differ significantly ($p < .05$).

no interaction effect involving time of test ($F < 1.0$), indicating that this pattern of bias was present both in the fall and the spring.

Mixed-heritage children. For the sample of mixed-heritage children, the main effect of ethnicity of target, $F(1, 31) = 6.45, p < .05, MSE = 23.75$, was the only significant effect in the (2 × 2 × 2) Time of Test × Ethnicity of Target × Language Program mixed ANOVA. This effect indicates that mixed-heritage children were significantly more positive in their evaluations of White targets than Inuit targets (see the third line in Table 2).

Due to the mixed ethnicity of these children, it is difficult to determine how this "pro-White bias" should be interpreted in terms of collective self-esteem. In a very real sense these children belong equally to each of the two ethnic groups. However, one means by which to consider this issue is to use the child's own self-identification. Recall that approximately 40% of these children identified themselves as Inuit. If the pro-White bias simply represents a more positive view of the ingroup, we should predict that only those mixed-heritage children who identified themselves as White should show this bias. Those identifying themselves as Inuit should not show this pattern.

A (2 × 2) Self-Categorization (Inuit, White) × Ethnicity of Target mixed ANOVA yielded a main effect only for the ethnicity of target, $F(1, 31) = 5.84, p < .05, MSE = 23.51$. No effect of self-categorization emerged ($F > 1.0$). The bias of mixed-heritage children who identified themselves as Inuit was virtually identical to the bias of those who identified themselves as White. Both groups evaluated White targets more positively than Inuit targets.

Collective Self-Esteem: Friendship Preferences

The final set of analyses involved children's selection of Inuit versus White targets as friends. Friendship selection is seen as a second indicator of the child's attitudes toward the ingroup and the outgroup and, therefore, as another measure of collective self-esteem.

Comparison of Three Ethnic Groups

A (3 × 2 × 2) Ethnicity of Participant × Time of Test × Ethnicity of Target mixed ANOVA yielded significant main effects of ethnicity of participant, $F(2, 99) = 5.17, p < .01$,

$MSE = 2.08$, and ethnicity of target, $F(1, 99) = 21.53, p < .001, MSE = 1.64$. These main effects were subsumed under a significant Ethnicity of Participant \times Ethnicity of Target interaction, $F(2, 99) = 4.44, p < .05, MSE = 1.64$. The means displayed in Table 4 indicate that, although children from all three ethnic groups preferred White targets as friends, this preference was larger for White and mixed-heritage children than for Inuit children. To further investigate this interaction and to consider the potential effects of language of instruction on friendship preference, separate analyses were performed for each of the three ethnic groups.

White children. Because all but one of the White children received instruction in their heritage language, only the (2×2) Time of Testing \times Ethnicity of Target ANOVA was possible. A significant main effect of ethnicity of target, $F(1, 11) = 7.05, p < .05, MSE = 2.84$, indicated that White children generally chose more White targets than Inuit targets (see the first line in Table 4).

The friendship choices of White children in our sample demonstrate a clearly ethnocentric pattern. White children chose nearly three times as many Whites as Inuit as potential friends. In addition, several findings indicate that this pattern of ethnocentrism increased over their kindergarten year. In the fall 30% of the friends chosen by White children were Inuit. In the spring only 10% of their chosen friends were Inuit. Frequency data show that the percentage of White children choosing at least one Inuit friend dropped from 58% in the fall to 25% in the spring.

Inuit children. A $(3 \times 2 \times 2)$ mixed ANOVA on the friendship choices of Inuit children yielded no significant main effects of or interaction for time of testing, ethnicity of target, or language program. Inuit children in both heritage and second language programs showed no particular preference for ingroup or outgroup members as friends.

Mixed-heritage children. The $(2 \times 2 \times 2)$ Time of Test \times Ethnicity of Target \times Language Program mixed ANOVA for the friendship choices of mixed-heritage children yielded only a significant main effect of ethnicity of target, $F(1, 31) = 11.21, p < .01, MSE = 1.24$. Mixed-heritage children chose significantly more White targets than Inuit targets (see the third line in Table 4). The preference for Whites as friends appears to occur equally among mixed-heritage children in both heritage and second language programs.

Table 4
Selection of White and Inuit Targets as Friends by Children From Each of the Three Ethnic Groups

Child's ethnicity	Ethnicity of target photo			
	Inuit		White	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
White ($n = 13$)	0.70 _a	0.84	2.00 _b	1.34
Inuit ($n = 59$)	1.86	0.93	2.04	1.06
Mixed-Heritage ($n = 33$)	1.21 _a	0.75	1.90 _b	0.90

Note. Analyses of simple main effects indicate that scores in the same rows with different subscripts differ significantly ($p < .05$).

Discussion

Several findings emerged in the preliminary analysis that are deserving of comments. Other researchers have found that the age at which children can accurately use ethnic categories varies across ethnic groups and across target groups (for a review, see Aboud, 1988). Relatively accurate distinctions have been found to develop in children as young as 4 to 5 years and as old as 8 years. It appears that our sample falls at the young end of this age continuum. At the beginning of kindergarten, most participants appeared to understand the ethnic labels and could use them to categorize themselves and other ingroup and outgroup members.

The general salience of ethnic categories appears to be a key determinant of the pace of development and the strength of children's awareness of ethnic categories (see Ramsey, 1987). It is possible that the present social context makes ethnic categories particularly salient, even to very young children. Inuit and White children are highly distinguishable by physical appearance, language, cultural practices, and social behavior. Even this small community has "ethnic neighborhoods," and meaningful informal social interaction is minimal. Thus, before entering school Inuit and White children are unlikely to have had significant interaction. At the same time, the community is small, and White and Inuit preschoolers are likely to be aware of each other. These conditions may be optimal for children to learn and accurately use ethnic categories.

Also of interest is the tendency of White children, and to a lesser degree Inuit children, to be more accurate in categorizing members of the ethnic outgroup than members of their ingroup. On the surface, this finding is unexpected. Children are likely to have had much more interaction with members of their own ethnic group and should be much more familiar with the characteristics and features of ingroup members.

However, the "ingroup overexclusion effect" (Leyens & Yzerbyt, 1993) provides a possible explanation for the more accurate categorization of the ethnic outgroup. In this case, the ingroup is protected by excluding individuals whose group membership is ambiguous. We are unaware of any other demonstration of this phenomenon with young children, and continued research is clearly necessary. However, that White children were most inclined toward this strategy supports this interpretation. It is the White children who showed the greatest level of bias toward the ingroup in other areas of our data. In summary, the present findings for ethnic categorization support the conclusion that, under some circumstances, children as young as 5 and 6 years of age may engage in categorization strategies that in effect act to protect their ethnic ingroup.

Personal Self-Esteem

It appears that in general Inuit children demonstrated lower personal self-esteem than their White and mixed-heritage peers. Several explanations are possible for this finding. The first is a cultural explanation that recognizes

the collectivist orientation of Inuit culture (Crago, 1993; Williamson, 1987). Although positive self-regard is clearly an important aspect of Inuit identity, individual recognition and public acknowledgment of personal achievement are not as central in Inuit culture as they are to White Canadian-American culture. Thus, Inuit children's lower personal self-evaluation scores may reflect a general cultural orientation toward personal humility.

Alternatively, the lower scores of the Inuit children may reflect less conviction about their competence in the context of school (Marsh et al. 1991). Despite the presence of a few Inuit teachers, the school atmosphere generally reflects mainstream Canadian-American culture. Thus, for most of the Inuit children, the school environment is very different from their home environment. Ogbu (1992) and others have described a number of potential difficulties associated with a home-school cultural mismatch. In the present case, the inconsistencies between the school and home environments may have reduced Inuit children's certainty about their abilities and competencies.

The general finding concerning the role of language of instruction on personal self-esteem appears to be that kindergarten instruction in heritage language was associated with increases in personal self-esteem, whereas instruction in a second language was not. As Table 1 illustrates, White, Inuit and mixed-heritage children in heritage language classrooms showed a considerable increase on our measure of personal self-esteem. On the other hand, Inuit children educated in a second language did not experience this increase. Mixed-heritage children receiving instruction in a second language actually showed a slight decline in their self-evaluation.

In terms of personal self-esteem, minority students enrolled in second language kindergarten programs appear to "miss out" on the benefits experienced by their counterparts who receive heritage language instruction. On-going longitudinal research may be able to determine the impact of this differential kindergarten experience on long-term involvement in education and academic success. However, these findings do provide initial support for claims concerning the potential benefits of early heritage language education.

The lack of a sample of White children educated in a second language prevents us from commenting on the impact of second language education on majority language speakers. Evidence from other research indicates that the outcomes for this group may be very different. Lambert, Genesee, and their colleagues (Genesee, 1983, 1987; Lambert, Genesee, Holobow, & Chartrand, 1993) describe very few negative and numerous positive consequences of second language education for majority language children. However, many of these studies involved English children in French-immersion programs, which are specifically designed for non-French speakers. Perhaps if English speaking children were placed in a Spanish, French, or Inuit class with first-language speakers and a unilingual teacher, their self-esteem might also be threatened. Clearly, more research is necessary to determine the relative importance of language status in the classroom versus language status in the society outside the classroom.

Collective Self-Esteem

The patterns of response on the ingroup and outgroup evaluation measures (see Table 2) and on the friendship preference measure (see Table 4) show considerable differences between the three ethnic groups.

White Children

The responses of White children on both measures demonstrated a clearly ethnocentric pattern. White children evaluated Inuit targets significantly more negatively than White targets and showed a nearly exclusive preference for White friends. In addition, it appears that White children became increasingly biased against Inuit targets over the course of their kindergarten year. By the spring testing, White children were nearly twice as positive in their evaluation of White targets as compared to Inuit targets, they selected over three times as many White as Inuit friends, and only 25% of them chose any Inuit targets as friends.

Of course, it is impossible to say whether the school and classroom experiences were the direct cause of this increasing bias against Inuit targets. Numerous other agents (e.g., parents, siblings, television, and the community) could also have contributed. Nevertheless, the role of the school is worth considering. Many of these White children would not have had any real contact with Inuit children prior to kindergarten. In every case, the class was taught by a White teacher in the White children's heritage language. Most, if not all, of the Inuit children in these classes did not speak or understand the language of instruction. It is very possible that these White children simply recognized the lower status of the Inuit children in their classroom and generalized this to a more global negative evaluation of the group.

In summary, it is not clear whether the particular circumstances found in these classrooms served only to confirm negative stereotypes that the children brought with them from home or elsewhere in the White community, or whether the classroom situation contributed to the development of new negative attitudes about Inuit children. Nevertheless, these findings support the conclusion that the school was, at the very least, ineffective in preventing growing negative attitudes among White children towards their Inuit classmates, attitudes that do not augur well for future intergroup relations between these two groups.

More generally, these findings point to the need for schools and teachers to take an active role in attempting to improve the attitudes of majority children in multilingual-multicultural educational settings. North American classrooms are becoming increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse. The climate of the intergroup relations in these classrooms can be an important determinant of success for minority language students. Decades of research on the contact theory (see Pettigrew, 1986, for a review) demonstrates that simple contact, such as sharing a classroom, does not necessarily improve intergroup attitudes. The present data illustrate a situation where linguistic diversity in the classroom was associated with increasingly negative intergroup attitudes among majority students.

Inuit Children

Inuit children generally showed a very mild (nonsignificant) preference for outgroup members as friends and equal evaluation of target White and Inuit children. Although most authors have described a slight preference for ingroup members as most indicative of a healthy positive collective self-esteem, the roughly egalitarian pattern shown by these children could be interpreted as fairly healthy.

However, this general trend was qualified by the effect of language of instruction. Whereas heritage language instruction was associated with a modest ingroup bias—a healthy collective self-image—second language instruction was associated with a bias toward the majority outgroup—a pattern indicative of a poorer collective self-image. The lack of a three-way interaction effect including the variable of time of testing indicates that these biases were just as strong when the children entered school in the fall as they were at the end of the school year. Therefore, it does not appear that the experience of the second language classroom was the direct cause of the lower collective self-esteem.

Children were not randomly assigned to language of instruction. Parental selection of language program resulted in a division of participants such that Inuit children enrolled in the second language programs arrived at kindergarten with a bias toward Whites. However, the kindergarten experience in a second language did nothing to reduce this outgroup preference and improve Inuit children's collective self-esteem. On the other hand, those enrolled in the Inuit program arrived at kindergarten with a mild ingroup preference. The heritage language experience did nothing to disrupt that positive collective self-image, or to increase it to the point of ethnocentrism.

In most educational contexts, children are not randomly assigned to language programs. The present findings support the possibility that minority language families who enroll their children in second language instruction might also be providing the child with other information about the higher status and importance of majority cultural and language. If this is the case, it is important that teachers in these classrooms be particularly diligent in their efforts to strengthen minority language children's perceptions of their cultural and linguistic ingroup.

Mixed-Heritage Children

Generally, mixed-heritage children showed preferential evaluation of Whites and a preference for White friends. These children's mixed ethnicity obfuscates interpretation of this pro-White bias. For mixed-heritage children who identify themselves as White, this pattern may represent a very positive collective identity, even ethnocentrism. However, the consistency of this bias among those who identified themselves as Inuit points to a more general bias toward the societally advantaged ethnic group. The trend for fewer mixed-heritage children to identify themselves as Inuit over the course of the year reinforces this interpretation.

It is likely that this general bias resulted from the recognition of the advantaged status of Whites in this arctic community. That 34 of the 36 mixed-heritage children in our sample were native speakers of English or French is an indication that the superior status of White culture may be reflected in these children's homes. In addition, television may transmit messages about the relative position of Whites over Inuit and other minority groups. The lack of a significant interaction involving language of instruction indicates that language used in the classroom may not have affected this preference for Whites. However, it is possible that the dominated position of White culture in the school environment served to reinforce existing pro-White biases. More research is needed to untangle the multiple potential influences.

The experience of mixed-heritage children is of growing general importance in the North American contexts. To date, there is a relative paucity of research on the experience of this group. The present findings appear to support the position that young children of mixed heritage are inclined to identify with their majority rather than minority heritage. Even in a community that is almost 80% Inuit, children with one Inuit parent and one White parent were consistently more positive about Whites.

Conclusion

The present sample appears in many respects to be rather unique. These children live in a small isolated northern community where the White "majority" population is small. The lifestyle and cultural habits of Inuit children may be very disparate from those of other language minority children. This apparent uniqueness may raise questions about the generality of these findings to children in other multilingual school contexts. However, on closer examination the experiences of the present sample may not be as unlike the experience of other minority groups in North America as it first appears.

The very limited exposure of the Inuit children in our sample to mainstream White culture may appear somewhat unlike the experience of other language minority children, most of whom live in large towns and cities. However, research shows that, for the most part, neighborhoods throughout North America remain ethnically and racially segregated (Bickford & Massey, 1991; Farley, 1984, 1985). This reality leads to a situation where preschoolers from many ethnic and linguistic minorities have very little contact with majority group members until entering school. Whether the isolation results from hundreds of miles of arctic tundra or several city blocks and a railway track, the world of many preschoolers includes relatively little direct contact with ethnic outgroup members.

The present context may also seem unusual because the linguistic minority is in reality the numerical majority in the community and the school. However, this is the usual occurrence in virtually every Canadian and many American Native reservation schools. It is also the growing reality for Spanish speaking children in communities in California,

New Mexico, and a number of other states. In all these cases, the majority of students are members of an ethnic or linguistic minority, whereas the school is dominated by the English language, White teachers, and White mainstream culture.

Clearly, the unique elements of the present sample and educational context cannot be dismissed. The generality of these findings must be tested with other minority language groups in different educational settings. In addition, longitudinal work will help to determine whether any of the present findings has an impact on long-term school retention and academic success. However, the present findings provide initial insights into the experiences of ethnolinguistic minority and majority students in terms of personal and collective self-esteem. They also provide some support for claims that early heritage language education can have a positive impact on the personal and collective self-esteem of minority language students—a benefit that does not appear to be provided by second language instruction.

References

- About, F. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- About, F., & Skerry, S. (1984). The development of ethnic identity: A critical review. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 3–34.
- Alexander, S., & Baker, K. (1992). Some ethical issues in applied social psychology: The case of bilingual education and self-esteem. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 1741–1757.
- Appel, R. (1988). The language education of immigrant workers' children in The Netherlands. In T. Skutnabb & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 57–78). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- August D., & Garcia, E. E. (1988). *Language minority education in the United States: Research, policy and practice*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Bickford, A., & Massey, D. S. (1991). Segregation in the second ghetto: Racial and ethnic segregation in American public housing. *Social Forces*, 69, 1011–1036.
- Brand, E. S., Ruiz, R. A., & Padilla, A. A. (1974). Ethnic identification and preference: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81, 860–890.
- Clark, K., & Clark, M. (1939). The development of consciousness of self and the emergence of racial identification in Negro preschool children. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 591–599.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155–159.
- Corenblum, B., & Annis, R. C. (1987). Racial identity and preference in Native and White Canadian children. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 19, 254–265.
- Corenblum, B., & Wilson, A. E. (1982). Ethnic preference and identification among Canadian Indian and White children: Replication and extension. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 14, 50–59.
- Covington, M. V. (1989). Self-esteem and failure at school: Analysis and policy implications. In A. M. Mecca, N. J. Smelser, & J. Vasconcellos (Eds.), *The social importance of self-esteem* (pp. 72–124). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Crago, M. B. (1993). Communicative interaction and second language acquisition: An Inuit example. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 487–505.
- Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, policies, theory and practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing.
- Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 60–67.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, 96, 608–630.
- Cross, W. E. (1987). The two-factor theory of Black identity: Implications for the study of identity development in minority children. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 117–133). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingualism Education.
- Cummins, J. (1990, June). *Language development among aboriginal children in northern communities*. Paper presented at the Circumpolar Education Conference, Umea, Sweden.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education: Aspects of theory, research and practice*. New York: Longman.
- Farley, R. (1984). *Blacks and whites: Narrowing the gap?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Farley, R. (1985). Three steps forward and two back? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 8, 4–28.
- Foster, M. (1982). Indigenous languages: Present and future. *Language and Society*, 7, 7–14.
- Freeman, M. A. (1978). *Life among the qallunaat*. Edmonton, Canada: Hurtig.
- Genesee, F. (1983). Bilingual education of majority-language children: The Immersion experiments in review. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 4, 1–46.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- George, D. M., & Hoppe, R. A. (1979). Racial identification, preference and self-concept. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 10, 85–100.
- Harter, S. (1986). Processes underlying the construction, maintenance, and enhancement of the self-concept of children. In J. Sullis & A. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (pp. 136–182). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hernández-Chavez, E. (1984). The inadequacy of English immersion education as an educational approach for language minority students in the United States. In Office of Bilingual/Bicultural Education (Eds.) *Studies on immersion education: A collection of United States education* (pp. 144–183). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
- Jordon, D. F. (1988). Rights and claims of indigenous people: Education and the reclaiming of identity. The case of the Canadian Natives, the Sami and Australian Aborigines. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 189–222). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Lambert, W. E., Genesee, F., Holobow, N., & Chartrand, L. (1993). Bilingual education for majority English-speaking children. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 8, 3–22.
- Leyens, J.-P., & Yzerbyt, V. (1993, October). *A social judgeability approach to stereotypes*. Paper presented at conference of Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–253.

- Marsh, H. W., Craven, R. G., & Debus, R. (1991). Self-concepts of young children 5 to 8 years of age: Measurement and multi-dimensional structure. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*, 377-392.
- Marsh, H. W., & Shavelson, R. (1985). Self-concept: Its multifaceted, hierarchical structure. *Educational Psychologist, 20*, 107-123.
- McLaughlin, D. (1989). The sociolinguistics of Navajo literacy. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 20*, 275-290.
- Moghaddam, F. M., Taylor, D. M., & Wright, S. C. (1993). *Social psychology in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Freeman.
- Newman, M. A., Liss, M. B., & Sherman, F. (1983). Ethnic awareness in children: Not a unitary concept. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 143*, 103-112.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. *Educational Researcher, 21*(8), 5-14.
- Pelletier, W. (1970). Childhood in an Indian village. In S. Repo (Ed.), *This book is about schools* (pp. 18-31). New York: Vintage Books.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1986). The contact hypothesis reconsidered. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (p. 165-195). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Platero, D. (1975). Bilingual education in the Navajo Nation. In R. C. Troike & N. Modiano (Eds.), *Proceedings of the first inter-American conference on bilingual education* (pp. 54-61). Arlington VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Porter, J. R., & Washington, R. E. (1979). Black identity and self-esteem: A review of studies of Black self-concept, 1968-1978. *Annual Review of Sociology, 5*, 53-74.
- Priest, G. E. (1985). Aboriginal languages in Canada. *Language and Society, 15*, 13-19.
- Ramsey, P. G. (1987). *Teaching and learning in a diverse world: Multiculturalism education for young children*. New York: Teachers College.
- Rosenberg, M., Schooler, C., & Schoenbach, C. (1989). Self-esteem and adolescence problems: Modeling reciprocal effects. *American Sociological Review, 101*, 1001-1008.
- Sampson, E. E. (1988). The debate on individualism: Indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and societal functioning. *American Psychologist, 43*, 15-22.
- Taylor, D. M. (1990, June). *Carving a new Inuit identity: The role of language in the education of Inuit children in Arctic Quebec*. Paper presented at the Circumpolar Education Conference, Umea, Sweden.
- Taylor, D. M., Meynard, R., & Rheault, E. (1977). Threat to ethnic identity and second-language learning. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 99-118). London: Academic Press.
- Taylor, D. M., & Wright, S. C. (1989). Language attitudes in a multilingual northern community. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 9*, 85-119.
- Trent, R. (1964). The color of the investigator as a variable in experimental research with Negro subjects. *Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 280-284.
- Tschantz, L. (1980). *Native languages and government policy: An historical examination*. Native Language Research Series, Center for Research and Teaching of Canadian Native Languages, University of Western Ontario, Ontario, Canada.
- Weiland, A., & Coughlin, R. (1979). Self-identification and preferences: A comparison of White and Mexican-American first and third graders. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 10*, 356-365.
- Williams, E., & Morland, J. K. (1976). *Race, color and the young child*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Williamson, K. J. (1987). Consequences of schooling: Cultural discontinuity amongst the Inuit. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 14*, 60-69.
- Willig, A. C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research, 55*, 269-317.
- Winer, B. J., Brown, D. R., & Michels, K. M. (1991). *Statistical principles in experimental design* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Received February 23, 1994

Revision received December 8, 1994

Accepted December 15, 1994 ■